

**WEST VALLEY CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES**

March 12, 2008

The meeting was called to order at 4:01 p.m. by Vice-Chairman Brent Fuller at 3600 Constitution Boulevard, West Valley City, Utah

WEST VALLEY CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS

Brent Fuller, Jack Matheson, Terri Mills, Phil Conder, and Jason Jones

ABSENT: Harold Woodruff, Dale Clayton, and Mary Jayne Davis

WEST VALLEY CITY PLANNING DIVISION STAFF

John Janson, Steve Lehman, Hannah Thiel, Jody Knapp, and Nichole Camac

WEST VALLEY ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF:

Nicole Cottle, Deputy City Attorney

AUDIENCE

Approximately ten (10) people were in the audience

SUBDIVISION APPLICATION:

SV-4-2008

Cassell Street – (From Southgate Ave (2740 S) to the north ROW line of the Light Rail alignment)

BACKGROUND

West Valley City is requesting a street vacation for a portion of Cassell Street, an unimproved “road” located at about 1400 West. The portion to be vacated is located between Southgate Avenue and the north edge of the future alignment for the light rail (LRT) extension to West Valley.

The request, submitted by West Valley City, is to vacate the right-of-way due to the impacts of the light rail on the adjacent property owner’s property. Light rail needs to acquire a large triangular piece of property from the Wilkins so that a smooth transition of the track can be accomplished from the north side of the open Decker Lake drain to the area just south of the Wilker’s home where the Decker Lake drain is in a large box culvert. The track goes over the culvert from the Brighton Canal to west of Redwood Road, where there will be a station. The box culvert area also has a portion of the Crosstown Trail which will be reconstructed as part of the LRT project.

In the past there have been some discussions of paving Cassell Street because it would allow for a north/south connection at the ends of several east/west roads in this area. The light rail alignment eliminates that future option since there will not be a vehicular/pedestrian crossing permitted here at Cassell Street. Although a future connection could be made south of the LRT alignment, the area to the north is cut off by the tracks. When the Wilker’s saw the plans for the LRT, they were disappointed to lose so much of their backyard. Although they are being compensated for that loss, the square footage of their property is considerably reduced and they wondered if they could lease or acquire the unused/unmaintained portion of Cassell Street adjacent to their home. This process would allow them to add 33’ to the east of their current property line. The other 33’ would become part of the Brighton Canal property.

Granger Hunter does have a water line in Cassell Street. They are requesting some improvements to the line or to abandon the line. Granger Hunter would retain an easement, if the line stays because of a system need.

According to City ordinance, streets and/or alley vacations shall be reviewed by the Planning Commission with a recommendation to the City Council.

RECOMMENDATION

- Approval of the Cassell Street vacation plat because the area is no longer needed since LRT will prevent it’s continuation to the south.

- Continue the application due to issues raised at the public hearing.

Applicant:

West Valley City

Favored:

Marge Wilker

1525 West Southgate

West Valley City, UT 84118

Discussion: John Janson presented the application. Commissioner Matheson asked if any other utilities are encumbering Cassell Street. Mr. Janson replied that there are none that the City is aware of. Commissioner Conder stated that future developments cannot be based on potential upcoming projects such as the Mountain View Corridor. Commissioner Conder asked if the TRAX proposal at this location is a solid and completed plan. Mr. Janson replied that it is.

Marge Wilker, the property owner involved in the vacation of Cassell Street, stated that the area being vacated is a hazardous location. Ms. Wilker explained that there is a lot of garbage dumped at this site and she has witnessed several drug trafficking incidents. Ms. Wilker stated that if this application is approved and she acquires this land, she will ensure that the area is taken care of and improved.

There being no further discussion regarding this application, Vice-Chairman Fuller called for a motion.

Motion: Commissioner Conder moved for approval

Commissioner Jones seconded the motion.

Roll call vote:

Commissioner Conder	Yes
Commissioner Jones	Yes
Commissioner Matheson	Yes
Commissioner Mills	Yes
Vice-Chairman Fuller	Yes

Unanimous - SV-4-2008– Approved

S-9-2008

Printers Row Condominiums

1780 West Printers Row

M Zone

1.02 Acres

BACKGROUND

Mr. Mike Neider, is requesting preliminary and final approval for the Printers Row Condominiums. The subject property is located on the corner of 1800 West and 2320 South (Printers Row). The subject property is located in the M Zone.

ISSUES:

The applicant is proposing an industrial condominium plat consisting of 1 building with 4 individual units. The definition of a condominium is the ownership of a single unit in a multiunit project, together with an undivided interest in common in the common areas and facilities of the property.

The purpose for the condominium plat is to allow the applicant an opportunity to divide the building into quadrants. Each would then be sold to individual businesses. All interior parking spaces, landscaping and common areas would be held in common ownership. The applicant would be required to submit a declaration and CCR's which would address the aforementioned items.

The existing site received conditional use approval from Salt Lake County in November 1973. At the present time, the property is developed including right-of-way improvements. All interior parking and landscaping areas were improved as part of the original site plan.

The City Building Official had questioned whether the building would be divided with property lines. If that was the intent of the applicant, substantial improvements would need to be made to meet fire codes. After discussing the matter with the owner, the proposed condominium will simply be a division of the building into individual units and not ground.

Title 9 of the West Valley City Code provides for condominium conversions. Although somewhat different than a residential application, many of the same requirements will apply here. The applicant will work with staff and other agencies to meet these requirements.

STAFF ALTERNATIVES:

1. Approve the Printers Row Condominium Subdivision subject to a resolution of staff and agency comments.
2. Continue the application to address concerns raised during the Planning Commission hearing.

Applicants:

Curtis and Michael Neider
8 Northridge Way
Sandy, Utah 84082

Discussion: Steve Lehman presented the application. Commissioner Jones stated that electrical work will be done on the condominium's and asked if anything else is planned. Curtis Neider, the applicant, stated that there are 2 electrical meters and 4 will be installed for the convenience of future tenants. A firewall between units is also being considered and will likely be added to each division of the building. Mr. Neider added that the painting and plaster inside the units have already been updated and there are no other major improvements.

Commissioner Matheson asked if current tenants will need to be evicted. The applicant, Michael Neider, stated that current tenants will be allowed to remain if they choose to. Mr. Michael Neider explained that several people are interested in buying a condominium and those who are not will leave voluntarily.

There being no further discussion regarding this application, Vice-Chairman Fuller called for a motion.

Motion: Commissioner Matheson moved for approval

Commissioner Conder seconded the motion.

Roll call vote:

Commissioner Conder	Yes
Commissioner Jones	Yes
Commissioner Matheson	Yes
Commissioner Mills	Yes
Vice-Chairman Fuller	Yes

Unanimous –S-9-2008– Approved

CONDITIONAL USE APPLICATIONS:

C-16-2007

Shoppes at Lake Park Sign Review

2911 South 5600 West

General Commercial Zone, 1.28 acres

Staff Presentation by Hannah Thiel, Planner I

Background

Trevor Gasser is requesting a condition of approval review for a monument sign. The monument sign would be a multi-tenant sign located at 2911 South 5600 West. The applicant was approved for a conditional use for the Shoppes at Lake Park Phase 2 on March 22, 2006 and then approved for a conditional use for a multi-tenant retail building on Pad 6 on May 23, 2007. This condition of approval review was initially reviewed in a Planning Commission Study Session on February 6, 2008. In addition, this condition of approval was continued from the Public Hearing on February 27, 2008.

The Shoppes at Lake Park Phase 2 site plan was approved at the time the conditional use was approved. This site plan did show potential locations for signs on the site plan. However, a condition of approval in each conditional use application for the entire Phase 2 as well as Pad 6 requires the applicant to bring in a sign plan showing sign elevations as well as locations of signs for Planning Commission review.

At a Planning Commission Study Session on February 6, 2008, Trevor Gasser requested the attached site plan as well as the attached multi-tenant monument sign be approved. The Planning Commission determined that one sign would be enough for that section of the Shoppes at Lake Park and approved the proposed multi-tenant monument sign on the corner of Highbury Parkway and 5600 West.

The multi-tenant monument sign that Trevor Gasser is proposing was intended as a sign for pad 6 and the second sign on the corner is meant to serve Shoppes at Lake Park Phase 2 and not just Pad 6. There are not currently plans for the sign on the corner that would serve the whole site, but it is intended to be a multi-tenant pole sign. The proposed monument sign is 10 feet tall and has a face of approximately 70 square feet. The minimum setback would be 10 feet from the street property line. The monument sign currently proposed is required to be located at least 100 feet from the sign proposed in the future on the corner if the sign on the corner is a monument sign (although a pole sign is currently desired). Approximately 80 feet is currently the proposed separation. Planning Commission does have the power to approve a lower separation between signs than that required by ordinance. The sign ordinance only allows one sign per 200 feet of frontage, where one frontage may have at least one sign. However, as this site has two frontages, the corner sign could be considered a sign on Highbury Parkway frontage.

Planning Commission Concerns

The application was continued from the Public Hearing on February 27, 2008 as a majority vote could not be entertained from any motion presented at the Hearing. At the Public Hearing as well as in Study Session on March 5, 2008, Planning Commission expressed concern for the amount of temporary signs that often pop up in windows and in setback areas that clutter an area further with signs. The Planning Commission also expressed concerns for too much signage in study sessions on February 6, 2008 and February 20, 2008. One concern is that too much and close proximity of signage can actually detract from the quality of a business and site. Another concern is how large the signs are that may go in around this pad. If all pads have a sign that is ten feet tall, they are so close together, and the businesses have wall signs, the area may feel flooded with advertisement.

Recommendations/ Staff Alternatives

- Alternative Approval 1 subject to any issues raised at the public hearing as well as the following conditions:
 - That the proposed multi-tenant monument sign be approved on the corner of 5600 West and Highbury Parkway, as approved in the Planning Commission Study Session on February 6, 2008.

- That no other monument or pole sign be approved on Pad 6 of the Shoppes at Lake Park Phase 2.
 - That a maximum of 25% of a window be used for temporary signs and that no temporary signs be placed in the setback area, adhering to West Valley City Code Section 11-5-102.
 - That a valid Building Permit be obtained for any and all Planning Commission approved signs.
 - That the Planning Commission reviews this application upon receipt of valid unresolved complaints.
- Alternative Approval 2 subject to any issues raised at the public hearing as well as the following conditions:
 - That the proposed sign site plan for Pad 6 be approved with the approval of the proposed multi-tenant monument sign.
 - That the sign proposed for the corner of 5600 West and Highbury Parkway return to the Planning Commission for review in a Study Session or if deemed necessary, a Public Hearing.
 - That all other monument signs proposed on 5600 West in the Shoppes at Lake Park Phase 2 (application # C-5-2006) be a maximum of 6 feet in height.
 - That a maximum of 25% of a window be used for temporary signs and that no temporary signs be placed in the setback area, adhering to West Valley City Code Section 11-5-102.
 - That a valid Building Permit be obtained for any and all Planning Commission approved signs.
 - That the Planning Commission reviews this application upon receipt of valid unresolved complaints.
 - Continuance, for resolution of any issues that may arise at the public hearing.
 - Denial of the Condition of Approval Review for reasons of “rational nexus”

Applicant:

Trevor Gasser
 74 East 500 South
 Suite 200
 Bountiful, Utah 84010

Discussion: Hannah Thiel presented the application. The applicant, Trevor Gasser, said that the ordinance states that signs shall *generally* maintain a 100 foot separation from other signs. Mr. Gasser explained that he feels this statement provides leeway and reminded the Planning Commission that the separation between signs on this site is only about 20 feet short of the recommended 100 foot distance. Mr. Gasser explained that signage is extremely important for in-line shops that are 500 feet away from the road and will not be easily visible from 5600 West. Mr. Gasser stated that potential tenants are comforted and influenced

by the knowledge that a sign will be provided to adequately market their business.

Commissioner Conder asked if pads 4 and 5 will be multi-tenant. Mr. Gasser replied that he is unsure and explained that these pads are ideal for fast food locations but these have now been banned on 5600 West. Commissioner Jones asked when the in-line stores will be developed. Mr. Gasser explained that the market is low right now but potential tenants are being discussed. Mr. Gasser estimated that these stores most likely won't show up for another year or so. Commissioner Conder questioned when the pole sign would go up. Mr. Gasser stated that if a big tenant were to enter the location it would be constructed at this time. However, it will most likely go up when construction begins on the shops. Commissioner Jones asked why the pole sign is a part of this application if the buildings are at least a year away from construction. Mr. Gasser explained that the sign would help secure potential tenants and added that this is the only location the pylon sign could logically go. Commissioner Mills commented that the appearance of the monument sign is attractive and explained that this was never her concern. However, Commissioner Mills added that some of the stones have fallen out of the Kohls and Michaels signs and is concerned about the upkeep of another monument sign with stone. Mr. Gasser stated that his company no longer manages that portion of the site but he will inform the property owners of the problem and ensure that it gets fixed.

Commissioner Jones stated that he is nervous about approving the location of a sign without the elevations but can see the value in marketing to tenants as well. Commissioner Jones added that he is comfortable giving discretion for the 20 foot allowance in this particular case and would like to review the elevations at a later date. Commissioner Matheson agreed. Commissioner Conder explained that he was initially opposed to approving the location of the pole sign but he can now understand the validity in marketing. Commissioner Conder expressed concern about the size and location of future monument signs on 5600 West. Commissioner Mills stated that disproving the location of the potential pole sign does not mean that it can't be approved at a later date, it just doesn't seem to be entirely valid in this particular application. Commissioner Conder disagreed and stated that the pole sign is important in relation to marketing on 5600 West and will likely help the developer attract tenants.

There being no further discussion regarding this application, Vice-Chairman Fuller called for a motion.

Motion: Commissioner Matheson moved for approval of the proposed monument sign and the proposed location of the future pylon sign subject to the pylon sign returning for review of elevations and the recommendation that temporary signage be limited

Commissioner Jones seconded the motion.

Roll call vote:

Commissioner Conder	Yes
Commissioner Jones	Yes
Commissioner Matheson	Yes
Commissioner Mills	No
Vice-Chairman Fuller	Yes

Majority – C-16-2007 – Approved**C-24-2006****Ken Garff West Valley Dodge Sign Review****4175 West 3500 South****General Commercial Zone, 11.61 acres****Staff Presentation by Hannah Thiel, Planner I****Background**

Ken Garff is requesting a condition of approval review for a pole sign located at 4175 West 3500 South. The applicant was approved for a conditional use for an expansion of Ken Garff West Valley Dodge on October 11, 2006 with condition # 2 as “All signage shall be approved by the Planning Commission as part of the conditional use. Detailed sign elevations and site locations shall be part of the sign plan.” The pole sign currently located on the Ken Garff site existed at the time this expansion was approved by the Planning Commission in 2006. The attached minutes from the original approval of the expansion of the Ken Garff Site indicates that the applicant was intending to use a monument sign on 3500 South but had not submitted any plans at that time. This condition of approval review was continued from a Public Hearing on February 27, 2008.

Ken Garff West Valley Dodge is proposing an electronic message pole sign. The maximum square footage for a pole sign is 200 square feet. An electronic message sign can occupy a maximum of 50% of the face of the pole sign. The applicant has submitted two renderings of pole signs and if the frame for the electronic message sign is not counted, one of them meets the requirement for a maximum of 50% coverage for the electronic message sign. The Planning Commission has the power to allow the applicant a larger percentage of electronic message sign than the 50% on the face of a sign. One of the two proposed options for a pole sign is 129.425 square feet with an electronic message sign that occupies 74.7% of the sign face. The second of the two proposed options for a pole sign is 197 square feet with an electronic message sign that occupies 49% of the sign face. Renderings for the two proposed pole sign options are attached. Both signs are at the maximum height of 25 feet tall. At 25 feet tall, the pole sign would be required to be located a minimum of 20 feet from the front property line. The proposed location for one of the pole sign options is in a landscaped area 200 feet from the eastern site property line and approximately 250 feet from the existing pole sign. The sign is required to be located at least 100 feet from any other pole sign and is limited to one sign per 200 feet of frontage on one parcel. The Planning Commission has the power to alter the required setbacks between signs. Only one pole sign is permitted per frontage, however, as the existing pole sign is on the corner of 4200 West and 3500 South, that

sign could be considered to have frontage on 4200 West, permitting a second pole sign on 3500 South. Since the Public Hearing on February 27, 2008, wall signs have been submitted for a building permit. These signs should be reviewed by the Planning Commission in addition to the pole sign being proposed.

Planning Commission Concerns

The Public Hearing on February 27, 2008 was continued as a majority vote could not be entertained from any motion presented at the Hearing. The Planning Commission was concerned about allowing another large pole sign for the Ken Garff West Valley Dodge site at the Study Session on February 20, 2008. Concern was raised that 3500 South would feel even more crowded with more signage placed on it. An additional concern presented was that as 4200 West is a public street, by ordinance, two frontages may be counted to allow two pole signs on site. This is a concern because the purpose of the ordinance allowing a pole sign per frontage is to allow adequate signage from two separate angles of traffic. As 4200 West is such a small street and the only development served by 4200 West that does not have frontage on another street is an apartment complex, it seems the notion for a pole sign on that frontage is 'double dipping' into the intent of the ordinance. If adequate signage is needed on 4200 West, it seems appropriate to locate the pole sign by the entrance to allow adequate customer circulation. Another concern for a second pole sign on site is how close together the signs would seem because of their sizes.

Recommendations/ Staff Alternatives

- Alternative Approval 1 subject to any issues raised at the public hearing as well as the following conditions:
 - As 4200 West is only required to access apartments and used as a secondary entry for Ken Garff, that only one pole sign be permitted on site along 3500 South; where the existing pole sign may remain standing, or taken down if the electronic message pole sign is desired by the applicant.
 - That the proposed pole sign with electronic message coverage of 74.7% be permitted at the proposed location by the entrance on 3500 South or replacing the existing pole sign on the corner of 3500 South and 4200 West.
 - That that no temporary signs be placed in the setback area, adhering to West Valley City Code Section 11-5-102.
 - That no off premise advertising be placed on the electronic message sign, as indicated in 11-5-107(1)(g) of the West Valley City Code.
 - That wall signs shall meet the size requirements of the West Valley City Code 11-6-104(2)(e).
 - That a valid Building Permit be obtained for the installation of a sign.
 - That the Planning Commission reviews this application upon receipt of valid unresolved complaints.
- Alternative Approval 2 subject to any issues raised at the public hearing as well as the following conditions:

- That the proposed pole sign with electronic message coverage of 74.7% be permitted at the proposed location by the entrance on 3500 South
 - That the existing pole sign be limited/alterd to a monument sign at its current location.
 - That that no temporary signs be placed in the setback area, adhering to West Valley City Code Section 11-5-102.
 - That no off premise advertising be placed on the electronic message sign, as indicated in 11-5-107(1)(g) of the West Valley City Code.
 - That wall signs shall meet the size requirements of the West Valley City Code 11-6-104(2)(e).
 - That a valid Building Permit be obtained for the installation of a sign.
 - That the Planning Commission reviews this application upon receipt of valid unresolved complaints.
- Alternative Approval 3 subject to any issues raised at the public hearing as well as the following conditions:
 - That pole signs only be permitted at entrances to the Ken Garff Site. This would require the existing pole sign to be moved from the corner of 3500 South and 4200 West to the actual drive entrance into Ken Garff on 4200 West.
 - That the proposed pole sign with electronic message coverage of 74.7% be permitted at the proposed location by the entrance on 3500 South.
 - That that no temporary signs be placed in the setback area, adhering to West Valley City Code Section 11-5-102.
 - That wall signs shall meet the size requirements of the West Valley City Code 11-6-104(2)(e).
 - That no off premise advertising be placed on the electronic message sign, as indicated in 11-5-107(1)(g) of the West Valley City Code.
 - That a valid Building Permit be obtained for the installation/ movement of signs.
 - That the Planning Commission reviews this application upon receipt of valid unresolved complaints.
 - Continuance, for resolution of any issues that may arise at the public hearing.
 - Denial of the Condition of Approval Review for reasons of “rational nexus”.

Applicant:

Craig Rigby
4175 West 3500 South
West Valley City, UT 84120

Favored (representing applicant)

Kevin Christensen
300 West 1100 South
Salt Lake City, UT 84010

Discussion: Hannah Thiel presented the application. Ms. Thiel clarified that any off premises advertising on the electronic sign is prohibited by code. This means that no other dealerships will be authorized to utilize the sign with the exception

of Henry Day and only if it's considered to be a commercial development with Ken Garff.

Commissioner Matheson questioned the logic of sharing the electronic sign. Kevin Christensen, representing the applicant, stated that the idea behind the electronic sign came from West Valley City. Mr. Christensen said that West Valley City had originally wanted to obtain an electronic sign and create an automall similar to the one in Sandy City. Commissioner Matheson asked if there is a physical connection with the Henry Day property. Mr. Christensen stated that there is. Commissioner Conder explained that the goal of the Planning Commission is to weigh the benefits of what businesses need and what is aesthetically pleasing for the City. Commissioner Conder expressed concern about the potential of the existing pole sign changing into something larger in the future. Mr. Christensen stated that Chrysler wouldn't allow this sign to change because it is a trademark symbol of all dealerships.

There being no further discussion regarding this application, Vice-Chairman Fuller called for a motion.

Motion: Commissioner Conder moved for approval subject to staff alternative number 2, striking item 2 and replacing it to state that the existing pole sign must return to the Planning Commission if any alterations are made.

Commissioner Matheson seconded the motion.

Roll call vote:

Commissioner Conder	Yes
Commissioner Jones	Yes
Commissioner Matheson	Yes
Commissioner Mills	Yes
Vice-Chairman Fuller	Yes

Unanimous – C-24-2006 – Approved

C-8-2008

CLC Associates, Inc.

West Valley Pavilion

2610 South 5600 West

C-2 Zone (19.86 Acres)

The applicant, CLC Associates, Inc., is requesting a conditional use permit for a grocery store and retail shopping center. The zoning for this area is C-2, General Commercial. The West Valley City General Plan anticipates Light Manufacturing and Mixed-Use development for this area. The surrounding zones include M to the east, C-2 and RM to the south, RM and A to the west and M to the north on the north side of the Riter canal.

The surrounding uses include vacant land to the east, the Balmoral Townhomes to the south, vacant land planned for condos and townhomes to the west and the Ritter Canal to the north.

The anchor tenant for this development will be a 94,683 square foot grocery store, which is Winco Foods. There will also be a 12,700 square foot retail space located directly east of the Winco Foods building that will be constructed in conjunction with the initial phase of the project. There are 4 pad sites that have been located along the south end of the site that will be developed at a later date and will be reviewed as a conditional use.

The building is constructed out of a combination of stucco, stone and brick. The east, west and south sides of the building will all be considered a primary façade and the north side is a secondary façade for the requirements of the Design Guidelines for Commercial Buildings.

This area is also located within the 5600 West Overlay Zone and must comply with the landscaping, streetscape and architectural requirements set forth in section 7-22-400, of the West Valley City Code. There is extensive landscaping and street trees along 5600 West however, the landscaping plan does not show trees along the new City road on the west side of the property. Trees shall be added to this portion of the site to meet the requirements of the Commercial Design Standards Site Transition requirements due to the residential use directly across the street. The development agreement also requires a berm to be incorporated along the west edge of the commercial parking area.

Providing pedestrian connections was specified in the development agreement for this property. The applicant has addressed this requirement and submitted a design for pedestrian circulation between the commercial and residential uses that is at least 5' wide. Circulation has been addressed within the development as well. Furthermore, there will be a 10' trail system with a 5' parkstrip along the north side of Parkway Boulevard and on one side of the new City road to the west. The other side of the City road shall have a 5' wide sidewalk and a 5' wide parkstrip. The design of this system shall be coordinated with West Valley City Public Works as the details and design of the new City road and bridge across the Ritter canal currently have not been determined. Also, as part of this process a traffic study shall be submitted to West Valley City Public Works Department for this property that includes all of the land uses on the entire overall 34.5 acre development.

Trees shall also be planted along the north edge of the site adjacent to the Ritter canal due to its visibility from 5600 West and to provide some screening of the loading dock areas.

The parking provided on site meets the requirements of the West Valley City Code. The pad site buildings will be reviewed at a later date however, they will not be able to have more than one single row of parking adjacent to the street. Additionally, parking spaces for bicycles must be provided on site.

There is a dumpster proposed along the east side of the site, which locates it away from the residential property. A 6-foot masonry enclosure must be constructed around the dumpster. The site plan also shows that it will be screened by landscaping. Any additional dumpsters for the pad locations shall be approved during site review for each specific building to ensure they are adequately screened and properly located so they do

not obstruct traffic circulation.

Signage for this project has not been determined at this time. A concept plan shows an approximate location for 2 pole signs and 3 monument signs, however, the specific number, design, setback, height, etc. have not been determined at this time. Therefore, a sign plan will be brought back to the Planning Commission at a later date for review in a public hearing.

Staff Alternatives:

Approval, subject to the resolution of any concerns raised at the public hearing, as well as the following conditions:

1. The building and site shall be constructed per the approved plans in accordance with the West Valley City Commercial Design Guidelines and the 5600 West Overlay Zone. The east, west and south sides of the building will all be considered a primary façade and the north side is a secondary façade for the requirements of the Design Guidelines for Commercial Buildings.
2. Signage must comply with the West Valley Sign Ordinance and the sign package will be reviewed by the Planning Commission in a future public hearing and is not part of this application.
3. A 6' tall masonry enclosure must be provided for dumpsters located on the site. Dumpsters for pad sites shall be reviewed as part of the conditional use application for the individual pad site locations.
4. All requirements of affected departments and agencies must be met including UDOT and West Valley City Public Works.
5. Any exterior lighting must be installed so that it does not negatively impact the adjacent residential property and in accordance with the guidelines in the Lighting section of the West Valley City Code (7-9-114).
6. The future pad sites shall be reviewed as a conditional use by the Planning Commission in a future public hearing.
7. All requirements set forth in the development agreement must be met. Please see attached Exhibit B.
8. Trees shall be planted along the new City road and the Riter canal at an interval of one tree for every 30-feet. Trees shall be chosen from the list provided in the 5600 West Overlay Zone.

Approval, subject to the resolution of any concerns raised at the public hearing, as well as the above mentioned conditions, substituting number 2 above with the following:

2. The signage shall the entire commercial complex shall be limited to 2 pole signs and 3 monument signs. The monument signs shall be no taller than 6' and 60 square feet in area. The location of the signs shall be in compliance with the West Valley City Sign Ordinance. No signage, except for directional signs, shall be allowed along the new City road due to the proximity to residential property.

Continuance, to allow for the resolutions of any issues raised at the public hearing.

Applicant:

Chris Hudon
420 East South Temple
Suite 550
SLC, UT 84010

Applicant

Matthew Idema
420 East South Temple
Suite 550
SLC, UT 84010

Discussion: Jody Knapp presented the application. Ms. Knapp added that details are still being worked out regarding traffic and routing and any concerns the Planning Commission have should not effect the approval of this application.

Chris Hudon, the applicant, stated that the design is consistent with all commercial design standards and meets the required ordinances. Mr. Hudon explained that this part of the City is important and it is the developers goal to create an attractive and beneficial environment. Mr. Hudon added that trees have been included along the edges of the development in the landscaping plans based on staff concerns and all dumpsters will be fully screened. Mr. Hudon expressed that initial concerns were directed toward large expanses of flat building spaces. The applicant has added relief to ensure that the building is more visually attractive. Mr. Hudon added that a full sign package will be provided at a later time.

Commissioner Matheson explained that he has concerns regarding truck traffic and typically on this particular length, UDOT may not allow additional truck access. Mr. Hudon explained that this complex is currently being reviewed and discussed by UDOT to ensure that the best plan is decided and applied. Commissioner Matheson said that another concern he felt was that there is no road going through the property. He stated that access should go through the parcel to the new City road. Mr. Christensen responded by saying that this causes a pedestrian connection to be lost and part of the goal for this area is to create a safe walkable development. Mathew Idema, also representing as the applicant, added that a road going through the property promotes cross through traffic from vehicles trying to circumvent signals.

Commissioner Mills expressed concern about the lack of left turns and the problem this presents for people who desire to leave the site and travel north. Mr. Christensen stated that the result of the traffic analysis projection for the year 2030 shows that traffic will be appropriately spread out and this traffic design fits into the larger scheme for the district. Commissioner Mills stated that this will

create a problem for the next 22 years. Mr. Christensen replied that there is no indication that this traffic plan will fail. The applicant has worked closely with traffic engineers to discover the best method of routing traffic. Mr. Christensen added that the majority of consumers will be coming from the south and east on 5600 West. Commissioner Mills stated that her traffic concerns are stemmed from residents that may shop at this location from Tooele. Commissioner Mills added that she likes the pedestrian connections and approves of the landscaping but has some concerns with the architecture of the roofline. Mr. Christensen explained that the roofline is intended to match other potential developments entering the area and is intended to provide a timeless feel to the area.

Commissioner Matheson questioned the marketing plan behind this project and if a pharmacy component will be added on one of the pad sites. Mr. Christensen stated that there is no pharmacy element to this grocery store. Commissioner Mills questioned if the traffic study has been conducted. Mr. Christensen explained that the traffic study has been completed and is comprehensive with the neighboring residential property. Commissioner Mills asked if the traffic study took into consideration the residential area to the east or if it was just the west. Mr. Christensen stated that the traffic study was done in conjunction with the property just to the west because it incorporates current ideas and plans for the area.

Commissioner Conder asked Commissioner Matheson what a road going through the property would provide. Commissioner Matheson explained that there would be less traffic in front of the building because customers would have two sides to choose where to park. Commissioner Fuller stated that he prefers the pedestrian walkway through the middle but it may be advantageous to expand the road in the center so the stop isn't as abrupt. Mr. Idema explained that a trip log was generated and there was nothing to indicate that the road would need to be expanded further back. Commissioner Mills asked how many cars can be stacked. Mr. Idema stated that 6 or 7 cars can be stacked and there is not a lot of wait time because it is a right turn out. Commissioner Mills asked if this new grocery store is comparable to Wal-Mart. Mr. Christensen replied that Wal-Mart is busy all day but this is a grocery store that has different peak times of shopping.

Commissioner Conder stated that the elevations are decent and he is okay with the appearance of the building. Commissioner Fuller added that the awning helps add to the visual aspect. Commissioner Mills requested that the applicant explain some of the material being used for the building. Mr. Christensen presented a materials board and explained where each material would be located on the architectural plan.

There being no further discussion regarding this application, Vice-Chairman Fuller called for a motion.

Motion: Commissioner Jones moved for approval subject to staff alternatives as well as emphasizing that signage must comply with the

ordinance and return to the Planning Commission for review.

Commissioner Conder seconded the motion.

Roll call vote:

Commissioner Conder	Yes
Commissioner Jones	Yes
Commissioner Matheson	Yes
Commissioner Mills	Yes
Vice-Chairman Fuller	Yes

Unanimous – C-8-2008 – Approved

PLANNING COMMISSION BUSINESS

Approval of minutes from February 6, 2008 (Study Session) **Approved**

Approval of minutes from February 13, 2008 (Regular Meeting) **Approved**

Approval of minutes from February 20, 2008 (Study Session) **Approved**

Approval of minutes from February 27, 2008 (Regular Meeting) **Not Reviewed**

Approval of minutes from March 5, 2008 (Study Session) **Approved**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:24 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Nichole Camac, Administrative Assistant